Statewide Voter File Subgroup
Vote Indiana Team
March 21, 2003

Members present: Linda Grass, Pam Finlayson (proxy for Laura Herzog), Brad King, Zach Main, Martha Padish and Todd Rokita. Facilitator: Sarah Taylor.

Others present: Sherry Beck, Barbara Fowler and Cathline Mullin (Marion County Board of Voter Registration Office), Julie Booth (Accenture), Nick Fankhauser (Doxpop), Bill McCully (Quest Information Systems) and Kelly Sprague (Manatron).

No additions or corrections were made to the previous meeting notes.

Secretary Rokita distributed a document explaining Indiana's estimated share of HAVA monies. Figures were gathered from the Federal Funds Information for States ("FFIS") Issue Brief dated March 5, 2003. Todd directed members to the Title 3 requirements money where funding for the Statewide Voter File is located.

Sarah Taylor handed out a draft survey to be sent to 10 states with unified databases. The group modified some questions. Additional questions were added concerning system security, interaction with the web and interactive voice response systems and the use of unique identifiers. Brad King will assist Sarah in contacting the 10 states. Pam Finlayson offered Michigan and Kentucky as the examples that the federal government used to base their legislation. Sherry Beck (Marion County Board of Voter Registration) handed out a list of functions her system currently handles that she would like to see as a starting point for the statewide voter file (SVF). Nick Fankhauser (Doxpop) was the Information Systems Director for Wayne County for 10 years before joining Doxpop. He discussed that in his technical opinion a local interface is a viable option. Brad reminded members that our SVF is subject to HAVA's legal requirement of a single system and auditing by the federal government. Pam added that when federal legislators were considering HAVA, they added language designed to prevent states from building a SVF with local interface.

Bullet point 9 under Statewide Voter File subgroup in the Task Lists for Subgroups document was next on the agenda. Members referred to Brad King's memo that they received on March 14, 2003. Brad believes county voter registration offices will likely see a decrease in overall spending. The SVF will replace an individual county's needs to have a system to locally maintain. Zach Main questioned why would there need to be local county voter registration offices if the SVF were to centralize their function. Overall the subgroup members supported the idea of leaving the administration of their function to the counties. Brad was concerned that the Indiana Election Division (IED) does not have enough personnel to perform ongoing SVF maintenance required under HAVA. **Consensus was reached on bullet point 9 that there would not need to be a "maintenance of effort" requirement at the county level for voter registration purposes however there does need to be a "maintenance of effort" at the county level for overall election administration.**

Brad comparing Indiana statute to HAVA led discussion on bullet point 10, ID numbers. Currently, Indiana comes very close to matching HAVA other than Indiana also accepts a Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV) identification number unlike HAVA. HAVA accepts the driver's license number or the last 4 digits of the social security number. If neither number is provided, the state shall assign a number to serve as the unique identifier. Brad pointed out the language in Senate Bill 268 (SB268) addresses the removal of the BMV ID #. Martha Padish questioned whether the Indiana driver's license number is unique by county. Discussion was held on the uniqueness of the number and what opportunity that should provide under a SVF to assist in keeping the list free of duplicates. Pam and Zach both stressed that the number should never change. **Zach will do further research on the uniqueness of the ID number and provide some language at the next meeting. Brad and Sarah will report on a meeting Secretary Rokita is having with BMV.**

Next on the agenda was bullet point 11 concerning replacing current procedures for voter list maintenance with new procedures. Brad directed us to the language in SB268 that repeals the duplicate elimination program at the start of the SVF January 1, 2006. Brad explained the current steps in the Duplicate Elimination program: counties are required to submit their voter file annually, the vendor (Quest) then compiles a statewide voter file; in federal election years, a match is run for duplicates, a postcard is sent to potential duplicate registrants and upon response by the registrant, U.S. Postal Service return, a report is created and sent to local voter registration offices so voters can be marked inactive. Under the SVF, it is clear that this program will no longer be necessary, but the procedure will be an automatic feature in the SVF. Brad also described the purpose of doing a jurisdiction wide uniform mailing under the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA). Upon no response or a U.S. Postal Service return, the voter will be marked inactive and their registration will be cancelled if there is no activity for 2 federal election cycles.

The next agenda will include a review of returned surveys, Zach's document of unique identifiers and bullet point 12 (coordination with other agencies). If time permits, the remaining bullet points will be discussed.

Public Comment: Sherry Beck (Marion County Board of Voter Registration) suggested additional information is needed to perform the duplicate registration program. She gave the example of a female voter who applied at the BMV but did not give a former address then the voter moves to another county and registers under her married name and doesn't give her former information. Sherry is concerned that the voter might not be identified under current parameters of the program but is a perfect example of why additional fields of information are helpful.

Bill McCully (Quest Information Systems) agreed with earlier discussion on the unique identifiers that additional fields of information would be necessary for a match.

The next meeting will be April 4, 2003.